

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
HARRISON DIVISION

MICHAEL S. GRIFFIS

PLAINTIFF

v.

Civil No. 05-3040

SHERIFF CHUCK MEDFORD;  
LT. BETH REELY; JIMMY  
KEELAND; MICHAEL BROWN;  
PETE MOSS; JACK GENTRY;  
MARK LOTTA; DR. THERESA FARROW;  
DR. DONALD CLAY; SHELIA M.  
HOWERTON; and REGINA FOX JEFFREY

DEFENDANTS

**ORDER**

By order entered on March 15, 2007, the court directed plaintiff to determine whether the rules applicable to him at the Arkansas Department of Correction (ADC) allowed him to have in his possession discovery responses that would consist of 10,000 to 15,000 pages of documents and would require multiple boxes to be shipped to him. If the rules did not allow plaintiff to have this number of pages of documents, the court suggested the plaintiff narrow his request for the jail logs to cover specific time frames rather than covering his entire period of incarceration at the Carroll County Detention Center. Plaintiff was directed to respond to the court's inquiries by no later than April 9, 2007. During the period of time it took plaintiff to respond to the court's inquiries, defendants were advised that they need not copy and send to the plaintiff the multiples pages of jail log that were responsive to his interrogatory.

Plaintiff has now responded to the court's inquiry (Doc. 112). He indicates that he that the ADC routinely stores legal materials that exceed what a prisoner may have on his person at one time. He therefore maintains there is no reason he cannot have the documents responsive to his interrogatory. He also maintains the defendants have attempted to alter the court's orders and add conditions or

requirements onto the court's orders to alter the responsibilities imposed by the court (Doc. 110). Plaintiff maintains the defendants are in contempt of court and in default as well.

The plaintiff's arguments are meritless. The court extended the defendants' time to respond to the interrogatory in question so the court could ascertain whether the plaintiff was in a position to receive the materials that would be sent to him. It would be pointless for the court to order the materials sent to the plaintiff if the materials were only going to be refused or confiscated and the plaintiff would have no access to the records once received at the ADC.

The defendants are given until **April 10, 2007**, to provide the jail logs to the plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 2nd day of April 2007.

/s/ J. Marschewski  
HON. JAMES R. MARSCHEWSKI  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE